

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/058,360	01/28/2002	Marcia Lynn Brandt	ROC919960172US2	5127

7590 07/15/2004  
IBM Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law, Dept. 917  
3605 Highway 52 North  
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

PESIN, BORIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/058,360

Applicant(s)

BRANDT ET AL.

Examiner

Boris Pesin

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 14, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by [www.webcrawler.com](http://www.webcrawler.com).

In regards to claim 1, WebCrawler teaches a computer with a data storage device including a computer usable medium having computer usable code to present a help window for a web page displayed on a monitor, the computer usable code comprising: first computer readable code to present a web page window on the monitor, wherein the web page window includes a web page obtained from a server (See Figure 1, it is inherent in WebCrawler that the web page come from a server); second computer readable code to receive a help request from a user for the web page (See Figure 2, Element 1). WebCrawler further teaches a third computer readable code to allocate a portion of the monitor for a help window in response to the help request (See Figure 2, If the user clicked on help, the web page changes to the help screen); and fourth computer readable code to present information to the user in the help window pertaining to the web page, wherein the information includes user- readable instructions

that describe how to accomplish functions in the web page (See Figure 3, the web page describes and helps the user to accomplish better searches).

In regards to claim 5, WebCrawler does not explicitly teach that third and fourth computer readable code means are obtained from the server. However, it is inherent in WebCrawler that a web page help function will be obtained from the server.

In regards to claim 6, WebCrawler does not explicitly teach that the information in the help window is obtained by the computer in a file from the server. However, it is inherent in WebCrawler that the information in the help window is obtained by the computer in a file from the server.

Claim 8 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is in the same context as claim 6; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 20, WebCrawler teaches a computer program device wherein the program is further to cause the digital processing apparatus to present the help window in response to a user-generated help signal (If the user presses on Figure 1, Element 1, Figure 2 with the help options will come up on the screen).

Claim 24 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 26, WebCrawler teaches a computer further comprising fifth computer readable code to request a help web page from the server in response to the help signal, wherein the help web page includes the help information (See Figure 1, Element 1).

Claim 27 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 28, WebCrawler teaches a method wherein the application comprises a web browser (See Figure 1); and wherein the application window comprises a web page obtained from the internet sever (See Figure 1).

In regards to claim 29, WebCrawler teaches a method wherein the help window comprises a web browser (See Figure 1), and wherein the help information comprises a web page containing user-readable instructions that describe how to accomplish functions in the application (See Figure 3).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over [www.webcrawler.com](http://www.webcrawler.com) in view of Dazey et al. (US 5715415).

In regards to claim 2, WebCrawler teaches all the limitations of claim 1. WebCrawler does not teach that the help window is displayed simultaneously on the monitor with at least a portion of the web page. Dazey teaches, "The graphical window containing the application is partitioned to define a help pane which shows the help content. The help pane is integrated into and appears positioned adjacent to a workspace to assist the user with context specific, step-by-step, instructions." (Column 2, Line 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify WebCrawler with the teachings of Dazey and separate the web

page and the help screen into two separate windows and place them adjacent to each other with the motivation to make it easier for the user to follow the instructions provided in the help window and at the same time performing the instructions on the main window.

In regards to claim 3, WebCrawler and Dazey teach all the limitations of claim 1. WebCrawler does not teach that the help window further includes a help frame and a table of contents frame contiguous to the help frame. Dazey teaches that the help window further includes a help frame and a table of contents frame contiguous to the help frame (Figure 6, Element 92).

In regards to claim 4, WebCrawler and Dazey teach all the limitations of claim 3. WebCrawler does not teach a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents and the help frame. Dazey teaches a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help frame (Figure 6, Element 92).

In regards to claim 7, WebCrawler and Dazey teach all the limitations of claim 5. WebCrawler does not teach a table of contents frame that presents hypertext help files pertaining to the web page. Dazey teaches, "the help pane 70 is expanded to provide an index area 92 which shows the index to the help content. This index allows the user to easily switch to other related help topics." (Column 6, Line 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify WebCrawler with the teachings of Dazey and include links to help topics with the motivation to allow the user to quickly switch to different help topics.



Claim 10 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is in the same context as claim 4; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is in the same context as claim 7; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is in the same context as claim 3; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 23, WebCrawler and Dazey teach all the limitations of claim 22. WebCrawler does not teach a computer program device wherein the program is further to cause the digital processing apparatus to present in the help window a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help

frame, the table of contents frame presenting hypertext links to hypertext files pertaining to the web page. Dazey teaches a navigation frame contiguous to at least one of the table of contents frame and the help frame (Figure 6, Element 92). Dazey further teaches, "the help pane 70 is expanded to provide an index area 92 which shows the index to the help content. This index allows the user to easily switch to other related help topics." (Column 6, Line 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify WebCrawler with the teachings of Dazey and include a navigation frame and hypertext links with the motivation to provide the user a convenient way to access different help topics.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US005572643A

Judson

Teaches a web browser with a dynamic display.

US005745681A

Levine et al.

Teaches a help option for the web page.

### ***Response to Arguments***


Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (703) 305-8774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100